



Itw

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Toru IWANE

Group Art Unit: 1794

Application No.: 10/589,356

Examiner: G. HIGGINS

Filed: August 11, 2006

Docket No.: 129046

For: MULTILAYER FILM OPTICAL MEMBER AND METHOD FOR
MANUFACTURING MULTILAYER FILM OPTICAL MEMBER

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the April 17, 2008 Restriction Requirement, Applicants provisionally elect
Group I, claims 1, 4-7, 11, and 12, with traverse.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish that a lack of
unity of invention exists between Groups I-VIII. PCT Rule 13.1 provides that an
"international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so
linked as to form a single general inventive concept." PCT Rule 13.2 states:

Where a group of inventions is claimed in one and the same
international application, the requirement of unity of invention
referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a
technical relationship among those inventions involving one or
more of the same or corresponding special technical features. The
expression "special technical features" shall mean those technical
features that define a contribution which each of the claimed
inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art.

A lack of unity of invention may be apparent "*a priori*," that is, before considering the
claims in relation to any prior art, or may only become apparent "*a posteriori*," that is, after

taking the prior art into consideration. See MPEP §1850(II), quoting *International Search and Preliminary Examination Guidelines* ("ISPE") 10.03. Lack of *a priori* unity of invention only exists if there is no subject matter common to all claims. *Id.* If *a priori* unity of invention exists between the claims, or, in other words, if there is subject matter common to all the claims, a lack of unity of invention may only be established *a posteriori* by showing that the common subject matter does not define a contribution over the prior art. *Id.*

Furthermore, unity of invention only needs to be determined in the first place between independent claims, and not the dependent claims, as stated in ISPE 10.06:

Unity of invention has to be considered in the first place only in relation to the independent claims in an international application and not the dependent claims. By "dependent" claim is meant a claim which contains all the features of one or more other claims and contains a reference, preferably at the beginning, to the other claim or claims and then states the additional features claimed (Rule 6.4).

See also MPEP §1850(II). ISPE 10.07 further provides:

If the independent claims avoid the prior art and satisfy the requirement of unity of invention, no problem of lack of unity arises in respect of any claims that depend on the independent claims. In particular, it does not matter if a dependent claim itself contains a further invention.

See also MPEP §1850(II).

The Office Action asserts, the inventions listed in Groups I-XIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features because the following special technical features are not found throughout the Groups:

- (a) Group I has the special technical features "with a transparent conductive film disposed on each of the transparent substrates" and "while applying an electrical field."
- (b) Group II has the special technical feature of curing the liquid crystal material "while holding in a magnetic field."
- (c) With regard to Group III, in light of the international search report the claims fail to define a contribution over the prior cited

references in terms of inventive step, and therefore these claims fail to constitute a special technical feature.

(d) Group IV has the special technical feature of a "plurality of liquid crystal layers;" further, the liquid crystal layers are not disclosed as being UV curable.

(e) Group V has the special technical feature "different hardening conditions and layered cyclically."

(f) Group VI has the special technical feature of a "polarization beam splitter," of which there is no disclosure in Group III that the device is capable of being a polarization beam splitter.

(g) Group VII has the special technical feature of a separate "application step" in which the electric field is applied prior to the curing step.

(h) Group VIII has the special technical feature of a separate "holding step" in which the magnetic field is applied prior to the curing step.

However, PCT Rule 13.4 expressly states that "subject to Rule 13.1, it shall be permitted to include in the same international application a reasonable number of dependent claims claiming specific forms of the invention claimed in an independent claim, even where the features of any dependent claim could be considered as constituting in themselves an invention."

Moreover, although unity of invention practice under PCT Rule 13 recognizes that alternate forms of an invention may be present in separate independent claims, or in a single claim, restriction between distinct embodiments of a single claim may only be required if there is a lack of unity of invention in that claim, or, in other words, the distinct embodiments share no common subject matter that defines a contribution over the prior art. *See* ISPE 10.09; MPEP §1850(II).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a unity of invention analysis does not hinge upon whether there are patently distinct embodiments or species (i.e., "each medium for detecting and its corresponding method has its own specially adapted features, steps, substrates, and inhibitors, etc.") but rather whether the distinct embodiments share no common subject matter that defines a contribution over the prior art (special technical

feature). However, the Office Action fails to establish that the embodiments defined in Groups I-VIII lack common subject matter.

Thus, for the present application, a lack of unity of invention may only be determined *a posteriori*, in other words, after a search of the prior art has been conducted and it is established that all of the elements of independent claim 1 are known. *See* ISPE 10.07 and 10.08. However, the Office Action fails to provide any references showing that the subject matter common to the embodiments defined by Groups I-VIII was known in the prior art and, thus, fails to establish *a posteriori* that a lack of unity of invention exists between the embodiments of Groups I-VIII. Therefore, the Office Action has not met its burden in establishing a lack of unity of invention.

Because the Office Action has not demonstrated a lack of unity of invention under the rules, the Restriction Requirement is improper. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirements are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Benjamin S. Prebyl
Registration No. 60,256

MAC:BSP

Date: May 19, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--